WORDSWORTH
ON THE
QUEEN'S SUPREMACY.

A DEFENCE

OF THE

QUEEN'S SUPREMACY,

AGAINST

Romish Aggressions;

IN

TWO LETTERS

TO A FRIEND IN FRANCE.

BY

CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D.

CANON OF ST. PETER'S, WESTMINSTER.

LONDON:

FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, AND WATERLOO PLACE.

1846.

LONDON:
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

ADVERTISEMENT.

THESE Letters are part of a Series addressed to a Friend in France on certain important religious questions of the present times. As, however, the subject on which they treat is distinct and complete in itself, the Author has been induced to publish the two present Letters separately.

April 25, 1846.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

LETTER I.

PAGE

ON THE TEMPORAL SUPREMACY.

Comparison of Triumphs of Heathen and Papal Rome . . 3
Subject proposed 7
Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance—their differences—and connexion 8
The Pope at this present time claims *temporal*, as well as spiritual, Supremacy over Sovereigns and Subjects 9
This assertion proved, from the Pope's own words.
I. From his CANON LAW ib.
II. From his BULLS from the eleventh century to the present day 11
Case of Napoleon and Pius VII. 13
III. From the ROMAN BREVIARY 16
Canonization of Gregory VII. and Pius V. Collects and Proper Lessons for their Festivals ib.
Remarkable facts with respect to them 19
Bull in *Cœnâ Domini* 20
IV. From the OATHS taken to the Pope, as prescribed in the ROMAN PONTIFICAL 21
Rome retracts nothing 23
Conclusion of Letter I. 25

LETTER II.

ON THE SPIRITUAL SUPREMACY.

Subject proposed 27
Misconceptions removed ib.
What the Queen's *Ecclesiastical* Supremacy *is* 28
Its grounds 29
What it is *not* 30
Misapprehensions on this subject 31
Authority for the Queen's *Spiritual* Supremacy . . . ib
Novelty of Romish usurpations 32
With respect to Investiture of Bishops, Convocation of Councils 33
Practice of the Church of England contrasted with that of Rome in these respects 32
Limits of the Royal Supremacy in England 35

PAGE
How its *exercise* may be impeded and embarrassed . . . 37
Case of France ib.
Consequences of the Charte of 1830 ib.
The real gainer by it not the People but the Pope . . . 38
Change of the relation of the French Church to the Crown and Country 39
Illustrations of this ib.
Its dangerous results 40
Suppression of Order of Jesuits in 1845 41
Contrast of *Manner* of *this* suppression with former ones . . 42
Rome the common Referee of the Crown and Church . . 43
Growth of her Power by these Appeals for Arbitration and Intervention ib.
Examples 44
Consequent danger to States ib.
Apologue of Horace 45
Practical Inferences ib.
Anticipations with respect to the future 46
Reference to England as compared with France . . . ib.
Warning 47
Romish Aggressions now meditated in some quarters in England ib.
I. Establishment of the Jesuits 48
II. Removal of Penalties for the Assumption of Titles by Romanist Bishops, &c. ib.
How this affects the Queen's Supremacy . . . 49
III. Introduction of Papal Bulls 50
Observations ib.
IV. Abrogation of the Oath of Supremacy 52
Remarks on this ib.
Pleas for these Propositions examined 53
I. "Darkness of the Age" when these Laws were enacted — in what sense this true, and in what not so . . ib.
Burleigh, Bacon, Clarendon 57
II. English Laws against the Pope to be *repealed;* the Pope never has repealed any of his Laws against England . ib.
III. Plea of *Toleration* examined 59
IV. Allegations examined, with respect to what is termed "*Relief* of some of Her *Majesty's Subjects*, from Penalties and Disabilities in regard to *Religious Opinions*". . ib.
Fallacy the first, in the words *Religious Opinions* . . . ib.
Whence the *Relief is* to be derived, and in what it consists . 61
Fallacy, secondly, in the words, "*Her Majesty's Subjects*" . ib.
Prayers for France 62
——— for England ib.
Hopes 63
Practical Inferences from the whole ib.
Respectful Address to Sovereigns and States 64
Conclusion of Letter II. 66

LETTER I.

London, April 24, 1846.

My Dear Sir,

Among the most interesting remains, now surviving at Rome, of its ancient glory, are its triumphal arches, and the two columns of the Emperors Trajan and Marcus Aurelius. The arches remind us of those magnificent processions which passed along the road on which these fabrics stand; and in contemplating them we seem to behold the captive princes and generals, the spoils and trophies, the crowned victims, and the lictors with their wreathed fasces, which preceded the car of the conqueror as he rode along the Sacred Way, followed by his laurelled legions, through the Roman forum to the Capitol. On the columns we view lively representations in marble of military campaigns with their attendant operations,—the making of roads and bridges, the felling of timber, the fortification of camps, the

scaling of fortresses, and all the series of the imperial victor's exploits wound round the column, as it were, in a gently ascending spiral, which carries the conqueror upward on a gradual acclivity of toil to a sublime eminence of glory.

Such are the existing memorials of the *temporal* prowess of the heathen mistress of the ancient world. By them we are naturally induced to pass to a consideration of the conquests of *Christian* Rome. If we could imagine a triumph (such as those of old) of the *Papal* power; if we could represent in fact, what the present Pope, Gregory XVI., who has written a book with that title, calls Il Trionfo della Chiesa,—The *Triumph* of the *Church* of *Rome*,—of what materials, sir, would it consist? You, as an enthusiastic Romanist, would say that the picture is easy to be drawn. Foreign nations brought under the gentle yoke of Christianity, the banner of the cross unfurled in lands beyond the limits of the ancient world, heresies put to flight, peace and truth proclaimed, and the pure faith every where victorious; —these (you would assert) are the constituent parts of such a triumph as you describe.

But, my dear sir, permit me to express my doubts whether this is really the case. I confess, for my own part, that I cannot by any means indulge in such pleasing imaginations as these. My representation of a triumph of the Church of Rome would be very different from this. It is impossible to think

without deep sorrow of the infliction of human suffering with which the glory of *heathen* Rome was purchased: no one can look on these arches and columns, to which I have just referred, without a bitter pang for the anguish and ignominy endured by those who succumbed beneath the victor's yoke, and served to adorn his triumph. But it is with feelings of far greater grief and shame that I reflect on what the human race has endured from the power of *papal* Rome, and on the sacrifices which *her* triumphs have cost the world. The former, I mean the *temporal* conquests of Rome, affected the *body* mainly; beneath the chains with which the captive's limbs were loaded, there often breathed an indomitable *mind*. Britain was subdued; but the heart of Caractacus was invincible: Numidia was subjugated; but nothing could bend the spirit of Jugurtha. But look at the conquests of Pontifical Rome. They concern the *soul*. In her triumphal processions man's REASON is led captive; his Conscience is in chains; his Will groans beneath a yoke; his immortal Spirit is bowed to the dust. Nor is this all. The arch of the Emperor Titus represents in sculpture the table of shewbread, the golden candlestick, and other spoils of the Jewish temple,—that is, all that was most precious and venerable in the eye of an Israelite, carried in triumph by the conqueror after the taking of Jerusalem. But this was a victory over the *dead*. The Levitical candles were

extinct, now that the light of the Gospel had once been kindled; the shewbread of the law had been spiritualized into the word of life; and now that the Christian Church was formed, the Jewish ark was but a cenotaph. But the "lively oracles" of God are borne in triumph by papal Rome. Prophets and Apostles are forced to pass under her yoke. Scripture is her slave. Again, on the arch of Constantine stand Dacian, Scythian, and Parthian princes in chains; and that of the Emperor Septimius Severus commemorates his victories over the kings of Arabia; but the venerable Fathers of the Christian Church of the east and of the west, must bend their necks beneath the stern yoke of the Church of Rome. The Chrysostoms and Basils of Asia, the Cyprians and Augustines of Africa, must stand with their hands tied, to wait her pleasure, and to do homage to her will. And not content with having REASON, SCRIPTURE, and ANTIQUITY as her captives, she must also have KINGS as her vassals to swell her triumphal train:—

Mox trahitur manibus REGUM fortuna retortis [1].

But all this, you will say, is a mere imaginary picture. Would that it were so! In my former letters [2] I have endeavoured to show that what I have

[1] Hor. II. Ep. i. 191.

[2] These are now in the press, and will soon be published.

here stated is borne out by the fullest evidence, so far as it concerns REASON, SCRIPTURE, and ANTIQUITY. There it has been proved that they are regarded and treated by Rome as her slaves: the only question which now remains to be examined is that which regards CIVIL GOVERNMENTS; and to that topic I would now request your attention.

You, my dear sir, are a subject of a monarchy; and you are, I am sure, equally desirous with myself that our respective countries should enjoy those blessings of internal peace, which constitute their real happiness, and on which their national security depends. It is true, we are not agreed on the *means* by which this end is to be *attained;* but on the following point I believe there is no difference of opinion between us, that the one great public practical question of the present day is this, what is the true nature of the authority of sovereign powers, (whether that authority may happen to be reposed in one, or diffused among many,) and how far it is and ought to be affected by the papal claims?

Writing to you from England, I shall beg leave to treat this subject mainly as it concerns my own country; not however neglecting the condition of affairs with you, which, I think, will be found very instructive by all who desire to form a correct opinion on this important subject.

To proceed then, without further preliminary, to the question before us. With us in England, who live

under a monarchy as you do, the Royal Supremacy is exercised in affairs of two kinds, viz. civil and ecclesiastical. Hence it is that as subjects we take two *oaths* to our Sovereign, one of *Civil* Allegiance, the other of *Ecclesiastical* Supremacy[3]. It will presently appear that the ecclesiastical jurisdiction is intimately connected with the civil; and whatever encroaches on the one must impair the other. But let us speak in the first instance of that authority of sovereigns and governing powers which is purely *temporal*. How is this affected by the papal claims?

You perhaps may say in reply, "It is not affected by them at all." The pope (you, as a Romanist, affirm) has universal *spiritual* supremacy, but he leaves sovereigns and states to exercise their temporal power without let or hindrance on his part. I must

[3] By Geo. I. Stat. ii. c. 13, these oaths are to be taken by every person on admission to any office ecclesiastical, academical, civil, naval, or military. The oath of allegiance is, "I, A. B., do sincerely promise and swear that I will be faithful and bear true allegiance to her Majesty Queen Victoria. So help me God." The oath of the Queen's supremacy will be found in the book of Common Prayer, in the "Form and Manner of making of Deacons." "I, A. B., do swear that I do from my heart abhor, detest, and abjure as impious and heretical that damnable doctrine and position, that princes excommunicated by the pope or any authority of the see of Rome, may be deposed or murdered by their subjects or by any other whatsoever. And I do declare that no foreign prince, person, prelate, state, or potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within these realms. So help me God."

beg to dissent wholly from this opinion. I affirm that the pope *does* claim, not only *spiritual*, but *temporal* authority over all subjects, states, and sovereigns; and with your leave I will now proceed to prove this assertion.

I shall not trouble you with any reference to the opinions and affirmations, in behalf of the pope's alleged *temporal* supremacy, of any of your great Romanist divines, although they were cardinals of the Roman court, and may therefore be supposed to speak with authority, such, for instance, as Bellarmine and Baronius, or of any unaccredited individuals whatsoever: but I shall proceed at once to the pope's own assertions and acts, in reference to *his own* power; and all the evidence which I bring shall be drawn solely from authoritative documents which I myself have examined.

I. First, then, let me call your attention to the statements in the pope's Laws concerning his own *temporal* power. You know full well, that Pius IV. affirms that Almighty God[4] inspired the council of Trent to require that oath to be taken, which is now imposed on all Romish ecclesiastics, lay and secular, in Great Britain and Ireland as well as in France: and you are aware also, that in this oath they swear

[4] In his bull, "*Injunctum nobis*," 13th Nov. 1564. Bullarium Romanum, tom. vii. p. 204, ed. Rom. 1745. The words are, "Dominus Omnipotens ad providam Ecclesiæ directionem sanctis Patribus (Tridentinis) in nomine suo congregatis divinitus inspirare dignatus est."

to receive without doubting, all things delivered, defined, and declared in the CANON LAW[5]. Further, the canon law contains the edicts of the popes; it is printed under their sanction; and they command all to receive and obey it[6].

In the edition of the Canon Law now before me, which was printed only seven years ago, with the approval of the Roman Catholic consistory of Saxony[7], I find it asserted by popes of Rome, that "the kingly power is subject to the pontifical[8]; that the pope has the right to depose sovereigns, to dispose of their kingdoms, and to absolve subjects from their allegiance[9]; that all oaths to the prejudice of the Church of Rome are null and void[1]; and that Romish ecclesiastics may resist their sovereigns for the good of their Church, and even for their own private advantage[2]."

Such, Sir, are the assertions which the pope makes concerning his own powers in his own laws, and which he publishes to the world, and requires to be

[5] "Omnia a Sacris Canonibus et Œcumenicis Conciliis ac præcipue a Sacrosanctâ Tridentinâ Synodo tradita, definita, et declarata, indubitanter recipio atque profiteor."—Ibid. p. 204.

[6] It is printed, "jussu Pontificis;" and Pope Gregory XIII. in his preface to it says, "jubemus ut omnia diligentissimè retineantur."

[7] Lipsiæ, 1839, in 2 volumes, 4to.

[8] Vol. ii. p. 190. Decret. Greg. IX. lib. i. tit. xxxiii. cap. 6.

[9] Vol. i. pp. 647, 648. Decret. II. pars, c. xv. Q. xv.

[1] Vol. ii. p. 358. Decret. Greg. IX. lib. ii. tit. xxiv. c. 27.

[2] Vol. ii. p. 350. Decret. Greg. IX. lib. ii. tit. xxiv. cap. 30.

received, and which he imposes by a solemn *oath* on Romish ecclesiastics: and all these asseverations, observe, concern *temporal* affairs. If, then, he does *not* believe himself to have secular supremacy over sovereigns, he is guilty of egregious duplicity; and any one who would deny that he claims such supremacy, would accuse him, not only of falsehood, but of publicly forcing it on the world.

II. But, secondly, these you may say are, it is true, assertions of temporal supremacy; but, you may add, let us see it put in *practice* by him, in order that we may believe that it is claimed. On this objection, however, you would not, I am sure, lay much stress; inasmuch as it is clear that, since the *exercise* of the power depends often upon circumstances over which the pope has no control, the *assertion* of it alone is a sufficient proof of his belief in its existence.

Still further, however, I will now show that the authority in question *has* been exercised by him continually *de facto* from the eleventh century to our own age, whenever no such controlling circumstances were in existence; and it would be preposterous, therefore, to say that claims put forward in this solemn manner, which we have seen these to be, are not most serious assertions. Let me remind you also that this authority has not only been exercised, but that the *records* of its exercise have been published at

Rome, under papal sanction, in an uninterrupted series up to the present time.

Before me is an edition of the BULLARIUM ROMANUM, printed at Rome, "*facultate et privilegio sanctissimi*[3]." In it I find the bull by which Gregory VII., Hildebrand, deposed the Emperor, Henry the Fourth, and absolved his subjects from their allegiance[4]. I see the same act repeated in another document in the same collection[5]. Passing over the bulls in which Pope Gregory IX. excommunicated the Emperor, Frederick II.[6], and in which Pope Innocent IV. deposed the same sovereign[7], I see there the bull in which Paul III.[8], in 1535, not only excommunicated King Henry the Eighth of England, but ordered his nobles to rebel against him: I proceed further, and find another similar document, in which Pius V.[9] (now canonized by the Church of Rome, as a saint) pretended to depose Queen Elizabeth, and to deprive her of what he called "*prætenso regni jure*," and to declare her subjects "for ever absolved from any oath, and all manner of duty, allegiance, and obedience to her;" and commanded them, on pain of excommunication, "not to presume to obey her

[3] In thirty volumes, folio, Romæ, A.D. 1739—1762.
[4] Vol. ii. p. 35. A.D. 1075.
[5] Vol. ii. p. 53. A.D. 1080.
[6] Vol. iii. p. 291. A.D. 1239.
[7] Vol. iii. p. 300. A.D. 1245.
[8] Vol. vi. p. 129.
[9] Vol. vii. p. 99.

monitions, mandates, and laws." In the year 1640 [1], Paul V., and in 1671 [2], Clement X., anathematized all Protestant princes and subjects as heretics; who by the papal laws are not only incapable of possessing any civil power or rights, but are amenable to temporal penalties, and even to death [3].

And to come now to later times, and to your own history. In the year 1801, Pope Pius VII., as you know, made a *Concordat* with Napoleon, then First Consul, for regulating the affairs of your Church. On the 24th of August, 1801, he, as head of the Church of Rome, published a bull [4], in which he agreed that all the bishops and clergy of France should take an oath of allegiance to the Republic, and he declared that he recognized in the Republic and First Consul all the rights and privileges of the ancient dynasty [5].

In another bull, dated 29th November, 1801 [6], he deprived about a hundred bishops of their sees, to which they had been appointed by the king of France. Nor was this all; in further confirmation of these

[1] Vol. v. p. 319. [2] Vol. xxi. p. 95.

[3] Decret. Caus. xxiii. Qu. v. c. 47. Decretal. v. tit. vii. cap. x. xiv.

[4] Beginning with the words, *Ecclesia Christi.* See *Bulles du Pape Pie VII. et autres pièces relatives au Concordat*, published at London, 1802, p. 25, where this, and the other document mentioned in the text, is printed.

[5] Ibid. p. 33.

[6] Beginning with the words, *Qui Christi Domini vices.*

acts of his deposing power, he went from Rome to Paris, where he crowned Napoleon emperor of the French on the 2nd November, 1804[7].

I have shown that the pope requires all his ecclesiastics to swear obedience to his canon law, and that in that law it is declared that he has the power to depose kings, and to absolve subjects from their allegiance; and I would beg you to observe, that by these bulls, to which I have just referred, the pope not only absolved all French Roman Catholics from their allegiance to their rightful sovereign, Louis XVIII., whom he himself had acknowledged[8] as such a few months before, but he bound them by virtue of their oaths to himself to take an oath of allegiance to another, (one, alas! who in one of his proclamations in Egypt, had a short time before declared himself a *sectateur de Mahomet*[9],) and that he not only indirectly deprived Louis XVIII. of his crown, but that he placed it with his own hands on the head of a usurper.

[7] See his Allocution to the Consistory of Cardinals, June 26, 1805.

[8] Ce Pape, par une lettre du 14 Mars, 1800, avait reconnu Louis XVIII. pour Roi légitime de France, il lui fait part de la nouvelle de son élection, il lui témoigne une prédilection particulière, il l'appelle Sa Majesté Très-Chrétienne, et la lettre a pour inscription, Carissimo in Christo filio nostro Ludovico XVIII., Regi Christianissimo. See L'Etat Politique et Religieux de la France, &c. Lond. 1806. The original letter may be seen in the Réclamations of the French bishops to Pius VII. Lond. 1805, p. 10.

[9] Ibid. p. 68.

It may be said that he exercised this absolving and depriving power (for such, in fact, it was) for the benefit of the Church, and the re-establishment of religion. So, no doubt, (in their own notions at least,) did Paul III. and Pius V., when they deposed King Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth; so did Gregory XIII. and Sixtus V., when they reiterated the sentence against Elizabeth; so did Paul[1] and Urban VIII.[2], when they forbade English Roman Catholics to take the oath of allegiance to King James I. and Charles I.

Perhaps, also, it may be alleged, that Pius VII. did not dare to resist Napoleon's will; that he acted from necessity. This is a very humiliating avowal in behalf of the so-called vicar of Christ. He had not the spirit of a martyr. But observe, sir, the facts of the case. In 1804, Napoleon usurps the dominions of Louis XVIII., and Pius VII. crowns him. But in 1809, the same Napoleon invades the pope's own territory, and the same pope excommunicates him[3]! On the whole, then, I adopt the language of Dr. O'Connor, one of the most learned of the Irish Romanists of our own age, who says, that by those bulls (of which I have just spoken), "Pope

[1] In 1606. [2] In 1626.

[3] In his Lettere Apostoliche in forma di Breve colle quali si dichiarano scommunicati e di nuovo si scommunicano gli Esecutori ed i Fautori della Usurpazione del Dominio di Roma e degli altri Stati appartenenti alla S. Sede.—Decimo di Giugno, 1809.

Pius VII. absolved all Frenchmen from their oaths of allegiance to the Bourbons, expressly alienating not only the crown of France, but also the properties of all French loyalists, secular and ecclesiastical, and hurling down from their sees above a hundred bishops, who were guilty of no other crime than that of fidelity to their prince[4]."

III. But, thirdly, *if* a Christian Church is ever insincere (which Heaven forbid!), it cannot, we would firmly hope, be in her public *prayers*. She must be in earnest *there:* and we should be guilty of the greatest uncharitableness towards the Church of Rome, if we supposed it possible that she could play the hypocrite in her spiritual communion with the omniscient Searcher of hearts. Let us turn then to her public Liturgy—her BREVIARY. Before me is a very recent edition, one of 1840, printed at Ratisbonne; I refer to the calendar prefixed to it, for the month of May.

[4] Columbanus, ii. p. 5, 16; see also p. 26, "Our bishops must unequivocally and by facts renounce those maxims of ultramontanism which have caused so many calamities to Ireland. They must recall their own acts in the Synod of Tullagh, by which they have sanctioned the pope's power to crown one king and uncrown another, and by which they have approved of his indirectly absolving the French from their allegiance to the successor of one hundred kings."—This work deserves special attention in these times. It has unfortunately now become exceedingly scarce. The present archbishop of Paris has also recognized in these bulls of Pius VII. an exercise of the deposing power. See his *De l'appel comme d'abus*, p. 293. Paris, 1843.

The fifth of May is a double festival in honour of St. Pius, the fifth of that name, the pope who pretended to depose our Queen Elizabeth and to order all her subjects to rise up in rebellion against her on pain of excommunication. He is now worshipped as a saint by the Church of Rome, and associated with apostles and evangelists of Christ. I proceed now a little further. The twenty-fifth of the same month is also marked in the calendar as a double festival, with a commemoration service in honour of Pope Gregory VII., Hildebrand, who, as we have seen, deposed the emperor, Henry IV., and who also is now enrolled among the saints of the Romish Church. But, further, certain Collects are appointed to be said in the Romish Churches on these festivals; that for St. Pius's day is as follows[5]:—

"O God, who for *crushing* the *enemies* of Thy Church, and for the reparation of Divine worship, didst deign to choose blessed Pius as pope, grant that we may be defended by his protection, and may so follow Thy commands, that we may vanquish the treachery of all our enemies, and rejoice with Thee in everlasting peace, through the Lord."

There are certain Lessons appointed to be read in the Roman church on this day, which are not taken from holy Scripture, nor from the Fathers, but

[5] Breviarium Romanum, Ratisbonæ, 1840.

have been composed expressly for this festival. In one of these Lessons (as it stands in p. 662 of the Paris edition of 1842, of the Breviary), I read that Pius is extolled for having "long discharged the office of Inquisitor with inflexible fortitude," and for having "displayed invincible courage in asserting the rights of the apostolic see."

The Collect for Gregory VIIth's day runs thus:—

"O God, the strength of those that hope in Thee, who didst strengthen blessed Gregory, Thy confessor and priest, with the virtue of constancy, for the maintenance of the liberty of the Church, grant to us boldly to overcome all opposition by his example and intercession, through the Lord."

But this is not all: in the year 1728, Pope Benedict XIII. appointed certain proper Lessons (like those for Pius Vth's day) to be read in all Romish Churches on Gregory VIIth's festival. The second of these Lessons contains the following words[6]:—

"He (St. Gregory) stood like a fearless wrestler (athleta impavidus) against the impious attempts of Henry the Emperor, and deprived him of the communion of the faithful and of his crown, and

[6] The original is as follows:—"Contra Henrici Imperatoris impios conatus fortis per omnia athleta impavidus permansit, seque pro muro domui Israël ponere non timuit, ac eundem Henricum in profundum malorum prolapsum fidelium communione regnoque privavit, atque subditos populos fide ei datâ liberavit."

released all his subjects from their allegiance to him —(subditos populos fide ei datâ liberavit)."

It was long since observed by Don Nicola Fraggiani, Secretary of State for the Kingdom of Naples, in a letter to the Emperor, Charles VI.[7], "that all those who read this Lesson would naturally think, that to have deposed an Emperor, and have absolved his subjects from their allegiance, was done by an unquestionable right belonging to the popes; and that it was a glorious and divine action on the part of St. Gregory, since the Church," which has canonized him, "makes it a subject of commemoration in the religious service" wherein she honours him as ranked among the saints.

It is true that Roman Catholic sovereigns[8] have interfered to prohibit the printing of this Second Lesson in Breviaries published in their dominions, and therefore it is not found in *all* editions; but as far as the Roman pontiffs are concerned, it may be said to be read in every church in the Roman obedience; and you may, perhaps, not be prepared

[7] Copia da Consulta de Nicola Fraggiani, Segretario do Reyno de Napoles, &c. Lisboa, 1768.

[8] As, for instance, Charles VI. and the kings of France. I have a Breviary, printed at Amiens in 1746, before me, which has been so carefully revised by the civil power, that neither the Lesson for Gregory's day, nor the Collects for his festival, or for that of Pius V., are to be found in it, nor are their days even marked as festivals at all; but both of them stand in the Irish and English Roman Catholic Directories of this present year.

to hear, that although neither the Lessons of Gregory, nor the Collects above-mentioned, nor any notice of these two festivals is to be found in a French Breviary (which I have before me) of the year 1746[9], yet that not only the Festivals and the Collects have *now* resumed their place, but that I see *that* very Lesson, in which Gregory is commemorated as a saint and a dauntless champion of the Church, because he dethroned Henry VI., and released his subjects from their allegiance, in p. 676 of the Paris and Lyons' edition of the ROMAN BREVIARY, of the year 1842, now in my hands. Such are the doctrines which the Church of Rome *now* preaches on her religious festivals in the Churches of France.

But further still: you have heard, no doubt, of the bull *in Cœnâ Domini*, which is so called, because it is ordered to be read annually in every Romish Church on Maunday Thursday, the day on which our blessed Lord instituted his Sacramental Supper. This bull, you are also aware, consists of a long series of imprecations (many of which are due to the so-named saint, Pius V.), ratified and renewed by above *twenty* different popes, against all Protestants, princes, parliaments, and people, whom it anathematizes as heretics; and, as heretics, incapable, by the papal law, not only of enjoying civil power and rights, but, as I have before said liable to temporal penalties, and

[9] See Note 8, above, p. 19.

even to death [1]. In the year 1688, your parliament at Paris affirmed, that by this bull the popes declare themselves sovereigns of the world [2]. And Cardinal Erskine, auditor of the late Pius VI., and "Promoter of the faith," in a letter to Sir J. C. Hippisley (August, 1793), confessed, that "although the formality of its publication at Rome is now omitted out of a compliment to some princes, to whom some parts of the said bull are obnoxious, yet it is implicitly in vigour in all its extension, and is likewise observed in all cases where there is no impediment to the exertion of the pope's authority [3]."

As far then as regards the pope, this bull, which anathematizes all Protestants, is recited every year in the course of Divine service in all Roman Catholic Churches: "it is implicitly in *vigour* in *all its extension.*"

IV. And fourthly, one of the most solemn acts of Divine worship is an Oath. When we impose one on others, or take an oath ourselves, we acknowledge and adore God's omniscience, we appeal to Him as knowing the secrets of all hearts, we confess Him as

[1] Decret. Caus. xxiii. Qu. v. c. 47. Decretal. v. tit. vii. cap. x.—xiv. Non sunt homicidæ qui adversus excommunicatos zelo matris Ecclesiæ armantur.

[2] See the "Proceedings of the Parliament of Paris upon the Pope's Bull, &c. London, 1688." Printed in the Appendix to Leslie's Case Stated, 5th edition, 1714.

[3] See Appendix to Report from Committee on the Regulation of Roman Catholics in Foreign Countries, p. 341, Lond. 1816.

the just and Almighty Governor of all the world, as the future Judge of all men, and as the great Avenger of all violations of truth and equity. And if any one oath can be said to be more sacred than another, surely it is that which a Christian Church requires to be taken by her ministers at the time of their ordination. Here, I say, we may justly expect that every word will be scrupulously weighed; every syllable will be uttered with seriousness and awe. There is scarcely any sin of which we would not believe it possible for a Church to be guilty, rather than that of dictating a falsehood in the oaths which she imposes on her ministers, at their inauguration in their sacred office.

Not now to speak of the Oath, commonly called the oath of Pius IV.[4], which the Church of Rome requires to be taken by *all* her ecclesiastics, secular and regular, by which they are bound to give "true obedience to the Roman Pontiff, the successor of St. Peter and Vicar of Jesus Christ," let us see what the pope requires from his Bishops. I refer to an edition of the Roman PONTIFICAL, printed at Rome by authority in the year 1818, and in page 62 of this volume I find the form of the oath to be taken by every Roman Catholic bishop at his consecration.

In it he swears to "be faithful and obedient to

[4] See above, p. 9. Jus Canonicum, p. 111.

his Lord the Pope (the reigning pope's name being inserted) and his successors; to assist them in maintaining the Roman papacy and the royalties of St. Peter against all men; to preserve, defend, augment, and promote its rights, honours, and privileges; to persecute and impugn, with all his might, heretics and schismatics, and rebels against his said lord[5]; to come, when summoned, to a Roman council; to visit the threshold of the Apostles (*i. e.* the city of Rome) once in every three years; to render an account to his Lord the Pope of all the state of his diocese, and to receive his apostolic mandates with humility; and if he is unable, through any lawful impediment, to attend in person, to provide a sufficient deputy in his stead."

When a Roman Catholic bishop is promoted to an archbishoprick, he again takes this oath before he can execute any function of his office even as a bishop[6]. His episcopal authority is, in fact, merged in the papacy, from which it is again to be derived. Here, then, my dear sir, we have a declaration from

[5] This clause, "to persecute," down to "said lord," is in some countries dispensed with in practice, because it is prohibited by the civil power; but its retention in the *Roman* edition of the Pontifical, ed. 1818, to which I refer in the text, is a strong proof that in this and similar dispensations Rome does in fact *retract nothing;* and that, the prohibition being removed, or the civil power being unable to enforce it, all the dormant claims of the papacy will revive with more than all their original force. See above, p. 20.

[6] Pontificale, p. 86, 87.

the Church of Rome of her own claims, made in the most formal manner, and continually repeated on the most solemn occasions. That man, I think, must have a very low opinion indeed of her honesty, who, especially when he construes this oath with her laws, her acts, her canonizations, her collects, her proper lessons, and her festivals, can do otherwise than regard it as a most solemn and explicit assertion of *temporal* supremacy on her part.

I am aware that in various countries, as, for instance, in France and England, the civil power has thought fit to require this oath to be accompanied with a reserving clause in favour of its own rights; but it is clear that by so doing it does not weaken the force of the obligation, which is imposed by the oath, to the pope, but, on the other hand, it only binds it more strongly on the consciences of those who take it. For by *adding* this clause to the oath, the civil power shows that it is aware of the existence and imposition of the oath; it recognizes it, and treats it as a legal oath, and as one not to be *abjured*[7]; and the state cannot be supposed by those who take the oath to be ignorant of the fact, (for, as I have already shown above, p. 10, the pope has publicly declared it in his canon law, which he requires to be universally received,) that all oaths, and, much

[7] As the Solemn League and Covenant was required to be, "as an unlawful oath, imposed on the subjects of this realm against the known laws and liberties of this kingdom," 13 and 14 Car. II. cap. 4.

more, all clauses of oaths, to the detriment of the papal authority, are utterly null and void; and if the civil power *is* ignorant of this fact, the blame lies with itself, and it must take the consequences—si vult decipi, *decipiatur.*

And now, my dear sir,—whatever other persons may think or say for her,—it is, I think, clearly evident from these documents which I have now cited, all of them consistent with each other, and all of them of an authoritative and solemn character, that the Church of Rome herself *does* claim *temporal* supremacy; in the words of our King James[s], "the pope not only claims to be spiritual head of all Christians, but also to have an imperial power over all kings."

I shall request leave to offer some observations on this condition of *civil* affairs before I bring my next letter to a close, in which I shall proceed to invite your attention to the second branch of the question before us, namely, to jurisdiction in *ecclesiastical* or spiritual matters.

I am,
My dear Sir,
Yours very faithfully,
&c. &c.

[s] In his first speech in Parliament, March 19, 1603-4. Parl. Hist. i. 983.

LETTER II.

You, my dear sir, as a Roman Catholic residing in France as it now is, feel considerable difficulty in understanding how a sovereign can be—what we affirm our own most gracious Queen to be—supreme governor under Christ of a National Church. From personal intercourse with you, and with others of your country, I know this to be the case. You cannot comprehend, you say, how a queen can have any ecclesiastical authority. I do not, indeed, believe that you would go so far as to approve the language which, as our King James I. tells us[1], was applied to his predecessor Queen Elizabeth by the Jesuit Sanders, who dared to assert that "the supremacy of a woman in Church matters is from no other than the devil;" or that you would adopt the words of one of your French divines, a vicar-general of a bishop, of the present day, who, in his directory for your

[1] Works, p. 282, Lond. 1616.

clergy[2], is so far forgetful of the apostolic command[3] not to "speak evil of dignities," that he has the boldness to speak of the illustrious wearer of the British crown as "une femme à la fois reine et papesse." But I know you and your countrymen generally are *now* strongly opposed—however in the times of your Fleurys and Dupins, De Marcas and Bossuets the case might have been otherwise—to our English opinions on this subject; and as I am firmly persuaded that your objections to them arise in a great degree from misapprehension of their true nature, I shall, with your leave, endeavour to explain to you what our opinions really are.

We believe, then, that sovereign governing powers are vicegerents and ministers of Almighty God. For so we are taught by Him in Holy Writ[4]. We know from the same sacred source, that it is our duty to submit to civil authorities, to pay them tribute, to pray for them, "that we may lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty; for this is

[2] Guide des Curés, i. p. 454, Lyon, 3ème edition. Ce n'est qu'à Pétersbourg et à Londres, qu'un autocrate qui est roi-pontife, et qu'une femme à la fois reine et papesse peuvent s'ériger en régulateurs du culte et en juges du clergé des sectes grecque et protestantes qui se glorifient de ne relever que du pouvoir temporel. Mais dans l'Eglise Catholique il n'y a que les évêques, les métropolitains et le Pape pour procéder à l'examen des matières spirituelles.

[3] 2 Pet. ii. 10. Jude 8.

[4] Rom. xiii. 1—6. 1 Pet. ii. 13.

good and acceptable in the sight of God[5]." If, indeed, they should so far forget their duty as to command us to do any thing plainly contrary to the Word of God; if they should order us to commit idolatry, or not to pray to God, or not to observe His ordinances, rather than be guilty of these sins, we should prefer the furnace with the three children of Babylon, and the den of lions with Daniel, and the rack with the Maccabees. Yes, we obey Cæsar for God's sake, but we cannot disobey God for Cæsar's; but in all his lawful and not unlawful commands we obey Cæsar as God.

True, you will reply, in all *temporal* matters, by all means; but *there* you must stop. No, we answer, we cannot stop here, for God commands us to proceed further. If, Sir, we consider, *what* civil powers are commanded by God to do for Him, we shall soon perceive that *our duty* to them extends beyond these limits. Sovereigns are God's "ministers" to us "for good[6]," not only of our bodies, but our souls; and it would be very degrading to them, and very irreverent to Him, Whose ministers they are, to suppose that their care is to be limited to the *temporal* wants of their subjects. No; here is the true dignity, the glorious prerogative of the kingly office; it extends

[5] 1 Tim. ii. 1—3. Matth. xxii. 21. Rom. xiii. 1—7. Tit. iii. 1. 1 Pet. ii. 13.

[6] Rom. xiii. 4—6.

to the *soul;* it has hopes and aims "full of immortality." It looks to eternity; it sows on earth that it may reap in heaven. Thus its earthly and heavenly happiness is wreathed into one crown. Yes; since the Almighty Himself gives to kings and queens the title of "nursing fathers and nursing mothers" of his Church [7], and since it is the *chief* duty of fathers and mothers in their families to provide for the *spiritual* welfare of their offspring, it cannot be supposed that the eternal interests of their subjects are not to be the *first* [8] care of sovereigns. This being so, it follows that they have a divine *right* to those powers, without which this duty cannot be performed. They have, that is to say, royal authority in spiritual matters, as well as in temporal. Let us proceed to examine in what this authority consists.

First, then, it certainly does *not* extend to the performance of any sacred function, such as the ministration of the Word or Sacraments, or to the ordination of Ministers of the Church. The power of performing these offices is derived from God alone, and is restricted to those spiritual persons to whom He has assigned it. He struck King Uzziah [9] with leprosy for invading the priestly office; and the prince who dared to consecrate priests [1] was Jeroboam.

[7] Isa. xlix. 29.

[8] Bp. Andrewes, Opuscula, p. 380, Religionis cura non modo regia est, sed in regiis prima.

[9] 2 Chron. xxvi. 18.

[1] 1 Kings xiii. 33.

Sanders, indeed, and other Jesuits of the day, pretended to believe that Queen Elizabeth assumed to herself the sacred office of ministering the Word and Sacraments, and they studiously promulgated a scandalous calumny to that effect. But this imputation was vehemently repudiated by Queen Elizabeth [2] herself, and by our Church in her Articles [3], and by our greatest divines [4]. From all which it appears, that when our sovereigns claim supremacy over all persons in all causes, ecclesiastical as well as civil, they assert their right and acknowledge their duty, not to perform any sacred function in their own persons, but to see that all they who have sacred functions assigned to them perform them duly. The royal supremacy in ecclesiastical matters in England does *not* admit of the exercise of any priestly power on the part of the sovereign, but it *does* imply that it is the office of the sovereign to command all those who have that power to *use it rightly.*

It appears further, from the same authorities, that this ecclesiastical supremacy is no other than that which belonged to the princes of God's own people,

[2] In her Admonition, see Bp. Gibson, Codex, p. 54.

[3] Art. xxxvii.

[4] Bp. Andrewes, Opuscula, p. 380. Bp. Bilson, Christian Subjection, p. 149. Archbishop Bramhall, ii. 219, 220. Bp. Stillingfleet, Eccl. Cases, ii. 97. Mason, de Minist. Angl. iii. c. 3. Bp. Taylor, Duct. Dub. iii. 3. Abp. Wake, Authority of Christian Princes, p. 10—12.

the Jews; and to the first and greatest emperors of Christendom. I pass briefly over this topic, but I cannot forbear reminding you of the important fact, that those of the Jewish rulers who exercised this authority most vigilantly and energetically,—as, for instance, David in convoking religious assemblies, in bringing back the ark, in regulating the courses of the priests, Solomon in building, Joash in restoring, Hezekiah and Josiah in purifying the temple, in republishing the book of the law, in putting down idolatry and superstition, and in bringing back the people to the true worship of God, in a word, in effecting a great religious REFORMATION,—are distinguished with special commendations and benedictions by God in Holy Writ.

But, you may say, let it be granted that the Jewish law furnishes precedents for the supremacy which you are maintaining, what authority have you in *Christian* antiquity for your principles and practice? I do not hesitate to say, Sir, in reply, that we have the *unanimous consent of all* ancient Christendom, after the empire ceased to be pagan, in favour of our English laws in ecclesiastical matters.

Compare, I would request you, my dear Sir, *our* system in this respect with that of *Rome*. A Roman Catholic bishop derives all his authority from the *pope*. No Romanist archbishop can consecrate a church, or confirm a child, without receiving the

Pallium from Rome[5]. All Romanist prelates are what they are, not by Divine Providence or permission, but by the grace of the apostolic see! All this is in direct defiance of the laws and practice of the ancient Church. Rome boasts of her antiquity. She comes to us, like the Gibeonites of old to Joshua[6], with clouted shoes, and worn-out bags, and mouldy bread, as if she had journeyed from a great distance, whereas the fact is all the while that, like them, she dwells close by; her antiquity is but of yesterday. It is notorious that "most princes in the west, as in Germany, France, and England, did invest bishops till the time of Gregory VII.[7]" It is certain, also, that the popes of Rome, who now claim[8] a right to ordain and place bishops throughout the world, were themselves appointed by the emperor till the ninth century[9]; and the Church of England treads in the steps of the ancient Church, when she acknowledges the English Crown to have the right of placing persons, whose spiritual qualifications have been ascer-

[5] Pontificale Romanum, p. 87. Antequam obtinuerit quis pallium, licet sit consecratus, non sortitur nomen patriarchæ, primatis aut archiepiscopi; et non licet ei episcopos consecrare, nec convocare concilium, nec chrisma conficere, neque ecclesias dedicare, nec clericos ordinare.

[6] Josh. ix. 5.

[7] See Barrow on the Pope's Supremacy, p. 228, ed. 1683.

[8] Bellarmin. de Rom. Pontific. ii. c. 18. Habet potestatem constituendi et confirmandi episcopos per totum orbem.

[9] S. Gregorii Opera, i. p. 216, ed. Benedict. Paris, 1705.

tained and approved by the spiritual authorities, in the sees which the Crown itself has founded, and in allowing them to *exercise* episcopal jurisdiction over its subjects within the limits duly assigned to them.

Again, the Church of Rome, as we have seen in the episcopal oath (above, p. 22), claims the power of convoking bishops from all parts of the world to attend her in her councils, and allows no ecclesiastical law to have any authority without her sanction. This too is in contradiction of ancient practice. *All* the General Councils of antiquity were summoned by *sovereign princes;* and there is not a single instance of any one Council claiming to be General, convoked by the *pope* of Rome, for a thousand years[1] after Christ; and the laws made by bishops in councils depended for their ratification and publication on the sovereign power[2]. Who then is the true follower of Christian antiquity, the Church of Rome—which obliges bishops by an oath to abandon their own dioceses, whenever summoned to Italy by the bishop of Rome, (whether their sovereign give them leave or no,) and to attend upon his calling, perhaps for near twenty years together, if the Romish synods are to last as long as the council of Trent, and which asserts[3] that the

[1] Bp. Andrewes, On the Right and Power of Calling Assemblies, vol. v. p. 141—168.

[2] Bp. Andrewes, Opuscula, p. 165.

[3] Card. Bellarmin de Pontifice Rom. Tota firmitas Conciliorum est a Pontifice.

canons of councils depend for their validity on the pope's assent—or the Church of England, which declares [4] that "General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of princes," and which acknowledges the right of her own sovereigns to summon the bishops and clergy of the realm to meet together in convocation [5], and to give effect to their decrees by sentence of ratification?

In all these ecclesiastical matters, that is, in the placing of bishops, in the summoning of councils and in ratifying their decrees, we acknowledge our sovereigns to have supreme jurisdiction over spiritual persons, to the exclusion of all *foreign* power, whether lay or ecclesiastical; and according to the ancient principles and practices of the Christian Church, and *for* the *maintenance* of her laws: but, observe, *against* these received laws and customs of the Church, no power is claimed by our princes, nor is any ascribed to them by us [6]. "Nihil potest rex, nisi quod *jure* potest," is our maxim. Our most gracious Queen has *supreme* power *according* to the laws, and *for* the laws, but *against* them, *none*. And we go further and say, that

[4] Art. xxi.

[5] See Declaration prefixed to Thirty-nine Articles.

[6] Lord Clarendon, on Religion and Polity. As sovereign princes cannot prescribe what laws they please, contrary to the laws of nature and of God, so they cannot impose what religion they please, contrary to what He has enjoined.

this jurisdiction, which I have described, is an inalienable prerogative of the English crown. You speak to us sometimes of our King John and Henry the Second, as having brought their realm under the spiritual dominion of the pope. Sir, not *all* the kings who ever sat on the throne of England could do this. As Lord Chancellor Clarendon says, "The king of England has *no power* to release a *single* grain of the *allegiance* which is due to him[7]."

The supremacy of our sovereigns in ecclesiastical matters, and over spiritual persons as well as civil, is founded not on any human basis, but on the immovable rock of Scripture. "Let *every* soul be subject to the higher powers," says the Apostle[8] St. Paul, and "submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake, whether it be to the king[9], as *supreme*," says the first and greatest of popes, St. Peter. It rests on the will of God, Whose ministers and representatives sovereign princes are, and Whose

[7] State Papers of Edward Earl of Clarendon, vol. ii. p. 309. So Hammond, ii. p. 133. "The king *cannot* alienate his regality." Thus he could not give titles from English cities to English Romanist bishops, on the ground of their consecration by the pope: this would be an alienation of the regale, and an act against the received laws and liberties of the kingdom; and since, as Blackstone says, i. 7. iv., "all degrees of nobility and other titles are derived from the crown," it would be an encroachment on the royal prerogative for any other power in the state to deliberate on their collation.

[8] Rom. xiii. 1.

[9] 1 Pet. ii. 13.

work human society is ; and the throne of the one and the peace of the other can never be secure, while the sovereign has only a *divided* sway, and while his partner in it is the pope.

Observe, my dear Sir, I do not say that the *exercise* of this power may not be embarrassed and defeated by reckless and revolutionary legislation ; or may not fall into decay by the neglect of those to whom it is committed ; for we all know that the *possession* of *rights* supposes the *discharge* of *duties.* Monarchs, therefore, may become mere phantoms, by the fault of their subjects or their own. But I am speaking of sovereignty in the abstract and not as monarchy simply, but as a form of civil government, (mixed, it may be, with popular ingredients,) to which by the divine law supreme authority within its dominions belongs. Let me illustrate my meaning by reference to your own history.

By your *Charte* of 1830, France ceased to have a *national* religion. She then thought fit to *suppress* the article of the Charte of 1814, which declared that she had a "religion de *l'Etat.*" By the same charte of 1830, she gave endowments to various forms of Christianity, and in 1831 she extended them to Judaism. Let us mark the consequences of these acts. She did not, it is true, directly deprive the crown of its supremacy, but she did virtually ; she rendered the *exercise* of it impossible. The Charte robbed the crown of its creed ; it divested the throne

of its religious character; it took from beneath it the only true support of a throne—Christianity. Before 1830, the language in France was "Le Roi ne tient sa couronne que de Dieu et de son épée;" but *now* it is "Il ne tient sa couronne que de la Révolution, fille de la Philosophie[1]." The state by endowing *all* religions does in fact endow *none*. It endows only religious *indifference*. It alienates them from itself. It has estranged the Church from the Throne, and placed it at the feet of the pope. By the Charte of 1830, France intended to establish the sovereignty of the People, but the event has shown that she legislated in fact for the supremacy of the Pope. No bull which ever issued from the Roman Vatican in the days of Hildebrand, has done so much for the papal power in France, as the popular Charte of 1830, which decreed the equality of all religions. You, my dear Sir, know full well what the language of the Roman Catholic Church of France *now* is. As *long* as the crown had a conscience and a creed, (of course I am speaking of the *office* alone,) so long, the Church allows, she owed it reverence. But *now* that the crown is obliged by the Charte to regard all creeds as equal, the case is very different; and the Church cannot (she says) any longer recognize that the civil power has any right to exercise any authority over her. No; the eyes of the Church of

[1] Journal des Débats, 13 Juin, 1845.

France are now turned away, alas! from the royal throne, and fixed on the papal chair. Instead of being a *national* establishment,—may I not say, *the* great conservative establishment of the nation—the Church of France has become an *extra-national* and *anti-national* one.

In proof of this, let me appeal to the course the Church has pursued and is still pursuing in the great question of national education. On one side we see the civil power—and the eighty bishops of France on the other. They assert that the state, having ceased to be Christian, has no right to[2] interfere with public instruction; that it cannot any longer pretend to discharge the great duty of a state, that of improving the moral and religious condition of the people, especially of the poor; that it has abdicated all power of maintaining truth and repressing error;

[2] Thus, for instance, the Archbishop and suffragans of Bourges in their memorial to the king in council, 16th April, 1844. *Aujourd'hui* l'état ne saurait revendiquer sur l'Education les droits qu'il exerçait sous *l'ancien régime*, car alors il y avait union entre l'église et l'état. Mais à présent ce principe est aboli. La religion catholique n'est plus la religion de l'état. La Charte proclame la liberté des consciences et des cultes, et l'état, qui est mis en dehors des croyances religieuses ne peut aspirer à diriger l'Education. And a layman, Count de Harrer, in his translation of the Archbishop of Cologne's work on the relations of Church and State, Paris, 1844, p. 114. says, Lorsque, comme en France, l'état ne professe aucune religion, il est virtuellement athée, et par conséquent inhabile à donner aucun enseignement religieux quel qu'il puisse être.

that the whole work of instruction must be left, without any restraint or direction, to the energies of individuals, that is in fact, to the Church of France, with all her ultra-montane affections and obligations, on the one side, and to the democratic license of a sceptical philosophy on the other.

This is a deplorable condition of things, and one which (unless Divine Providence should interfere) must inevitably produce the most disastrous results, too dreadful to contemplate. What indeed can be more lamentable than to see that they—I mean the bishops of France—who ought to be the most faithful and zealous supporters of the throne, and who would doubtless be so, if their circumstances were different, that is, if they were released from their oath of vassalage to the pope, and if the *crown* had a *creed*, are in fact now the devoted subjects of a foreign and hostile power.

A slight incident will illustrate what I am saying. The *reappearance* of the Proper Lesson for Gregory the VIIth's Day in your Parisian and Lyonnaise Breviary of 1842 (to which I alluded in my last letter[3]) speaks volumes concerning the ultra-montane spirit which now animates your Church. But what I now advert to is a different circumstance, though not of a dissimilar kind. Your bishops take an oath to the pope[4], one of the clauses of which is, that they

[3] See above page 17—20.

[4] See above page 22, 34.

will visit Rome once in so many years, and render an account to him of the state of their dioceses. By your *civil* laws, the bishop is bound to obtain the king's leave before he quits his diocese on his journey to Rome[5]. But when last year one of your prelates visited Rome, and it was stated that he had not obtained any such previous permission, the reply of the organs[6] of the Church was, that the preventive law might have been very well for the time of Louis XIV., when the sovereigns of France bore the august title of *most Christian king*, but that it would be a violation of the *liberties of the Church*, if it were enforced *now*. Upon which I would only beg leave to ask one question. If this be so, *whose* subjects are your bishops? the king's or the pope's? Clearly, the pope's?

Let me add another observation on the papal advantages derived from what is not unfrequently, but most untruly, called *popular* legislation. Last year you suppressed the order of Jesuits in France. This was no new thing with you. In 1610, the year of the murder of Henry IV., you burnt their books by order of parliament. In 1644, your university[7] petitioned parliament against them, affirming that "their doctrines affected the security of all states and nations

[5] Articles Organiques, section iii. § 20.

[6] Univers Catholique, 23 Nov. 1845.

[7] See the original words in the edition of Fleury's Discours sur les Libertés de l'Eglise Gallicane, 1765, p. 82.

interested in preserving the authority and just power and life of their sovereigns." In 1682, your clergy, with the great Bossuet at their head, protected the crown and the constitution from their anti-monarchical and anti-social principles, by the declaration of the Gallican Articles. In 1763, the parliament of Paris declared by its decree of the 6th of August, that the "order of Jesuits was by its nature inadmissible in all rightly constituted states[8];" and it was suppressed accordingly.

But since your last Revolution affairs have greatly changed in your country, in this as in other matters. Your clergy appear to be desirous at present of *identifying* themselves with the *Jesuits*. Some of your bishops have come forward as their champions. The Bishop of Chartres declares in his published letter to the Minister of Religion[9], that "he knows that many archbishops and bishops have intimated to him (the minister), that if the Jesuits are driven from their houses, they will be received by them into their palaces." What a change does this indicate in the *animus* of the Church of France toward the crown! What a demonstration is here of its determination

[8] Ibid. p. 404.

[9] "Je sais, M. le Ministre, que plusieurs archevêques et évêques vous ont fait connnaître que si les Jésuites étaient chassés de leurs maisons ceux-ci trouveraient un asile dans celles qu'ils habitent eux-mêmes." *Lettre* de Mgr. l'Evêque de Chartres à M. le Ministre des Cultes, 19 Mai, 1845. See also the letter of the Bp. of Chalons to the *Univers*, 28 May, 1845.

to make common cause with the papacy in its most anti-monarchical form!

But let us observe further, that not only the Church, being repudiated by the Crown, but the Crown also, being opposed by the Church, is driven to do homage to the pope. He gains both ways, by the separation of the two. He has become the common referree for both parties: and has grown in strength and importance accordingly. Instead of *prohibiting* appeals to Rome, your State is now *making* them in its own behalf. Your most zealous Romanists deplored the suppression of the Jesuits in France last year; but they must have derived great consolation from the *manner* in which that measure was effected. The State said to the Jesuits, "We know you to be dangerous to our peace and safety, and we therefore wish you to be suppressed;" but it did *not* say, as was *formerly* the case, and as, if it were independent, it certainly would have done *now*,—"We know you to be dangerous, and, therefore, *we* exercise *our own power*, and suppress you." No: Signor Rossi is sent to Rome, on a special mission to the pope, to induce him to use his influence with father Roothman, the General of the Jesuits, for their suppression; and they are withdrawn from France accordingly. What was this but a public announcement of the feebleness of the civil power, and of the superiority of that of the pope? He might have been sorry to exercise this power,

as probably he was, in the present case; but then the *appeal* to him to exercise it, was a recognition of its existence on the part of his only rival, the State.

II. Nothing can be more gratifying to him, or more conducive to his aggrandizement, than such applications as these from sovereign princes, that he would be pleased to vouchsafe them the benefit of his pontifical interference to keep their kingdoms quiet. It is what he must most covet, and in which he must most exult. See, he must say, how necessary the papacy is to the world! How could you govern your people without me? You speak of me as a disturber of public tranquillity, but the fact is, as your appeals to me show, I am the great pacificator of the world.

So it is, now, my dear sir; political storms are raised by winds let loose from the papal caverns; and then the pope is implored by civil governments to allay them: and he even pretends to be angry (like the poet's Neptune), with the political Euri and Zephyri, which have broken forth from his own Æolia —"Quos ego"—(he exclaims)—

"—— sed motos præstat componere fluctus[1]."

And he, the canonizer of Hildebrand, will preach sermons on loyalty, forsooth, for the benefit of kings, as he did to the Polish bishops in 1832[2], and as he is now doing to those of Galicia in his brief to the

[1] Virgil. Æn. i. 135.

[2] See the Brief in the Pièces Justificatives of La Mennais' Affaires de Rome, p. 309.

Bishop of Tarnow[3], and as he did a little while since to the titular prelates of Ireland; and as I doubt not, the man did to the stag, for the special benefit of the horse, in the wise apologue of Horace [4], with which the pope is doubtless familiar; and he well knows, that in being called in by princes and states, to read these his irenical and most ironical homilies, his universal power is acknowledged; and once placed on the horse's back, at the horse's request, he remains there firmly seated for ever—

> Cervus equum, pugnâ melior, communibus herbis
> Pellebat, donec minor in certamine longo
> Imploravit opes Hominis, frænumque recepit;
> Sed postquam violens victo decessit ab hoste,
> Non equitem dorso, non frænum depulit ore.

Let those sovereigns who humbly sue to the pope for concordats, wherewith to keep their own subjects in order, bethink them betimes how they will be able to shake the Man from off their backs, and to get his bit out of their mouths.

Let, I say in sober sadness, both sovereigns and subjects reflect, that if they desert or weaken the foundation on which alone governments can rest independently and immoveably, namely, religion, the royal power is gone, and the safety, the happiness,

[3] Which will be found in the Tablet of April 18, 1846. It is observable that the pope there exhorts the Clergy to obey the emperor, "*nisi* forte aliquid imperetur, quod Dei et *Ecclesiæ* legibus adversatur."

[4] Hor. Epist. i. 10, 34.

and the liberties of the subject are destroyed; and the world may shortly be prepared to see this fearful conquence—that the only surviving power claiming to exist by divine institution will be that of the pope; and all thrones, which are not swept away by infidel fury, will exist only as feudatories of the papacy.

Do not suppose, my dear sir, that I pretend to anticipate any great final triumph of the papacy. No; if I may venture to speak of the future, I should rather prognosticate that the papal power, elated by its present temporary successes, will become more self-confident, arrogant, and presumptuous, and that it will exhibit itself to the world as more superstitious and corrupt in its religion, and more anti-social and arbitrary in its politics; that it will thus give new impulses and additional force to the counteracting movements of infidelity and anarchy, and will provoke a feeling of general impatience and exasperation against its own exorbitant usurpations; and that it will at length be the victim of a spirit as turbulent and antichristian as its own, which it will have created and armed against itself.

But to return. I have referred to the example of France in what I have now written; but you will not, I hope, imagine that what I have said is dictated by any unfriendly feeling towards your institutions, or that I think it may not be applied in a considerable degree, with equal justice, to ourselves. Indeed, if the truth is to be told, many of us in England are much

more deficient in the discharge of our duty to our own sovereign than you are to yours. You are for the most part Roman Catholics, and believing as you do —though, as we think, very erroneously—that the pope is the father of the faithful, and the vicar of our Lord upon earth, you may regard the extension of his power without dissatisfaction; and considering the unhappy condition to which your monarchy has been reduced, you may feel more loyalty to the see of St. Peter, than to the throne of the sovereigns of France.

But our case is very different. Publicly we know nothing of the pope except as a foreign potentate, who has thought fit to excommunicate us, and pretended to depose three of our monarchs, and to send a Spanish Armada against us, and to place our country under an interdict.

Besides, by the Divine goodness, we have still a *Christian* monarchy; and by the blessing of Heaven on the valour and wisdom of our ancestors, we have a constitution in which the supremacy of the sovereign over all persons in all causes is so happily established, that I venture to affirm that no nation in the world can show a framework of government so well adapted to secure the rights of the sovereign and the liberties of the subject from domestic and foreign usurpation, whether lay or ecclesiastical. Our only danger is from ourselves.

And it must be confessed with sorrow, that (not-

withstanding the solemn warning which we have from *your* example) much has been done and much is now doing by some who bear the name of Englishmen for the disorganization and disruption of this well-concerted and harmonious system; much for the destruction of the foundations of our throne, and for the disturbance of our domestic happiness and peace.

To speak briefly of particulars:—

I. You are aware that some in this country are desirous of legalizing the settlement of Jesuits in England, although it is notorious that they take an oath of implicit obedience to the pope[5]; and are not and *cannot* be the subjects of any temporal sovereign, much less of a Protestant one. Here they outrun you in zeal for the papacy; last year *you suppressed* the order of Jesuits in Roman Catholic France, this year some of us would establish them in Protestant England.

II. Secondly, some of us in England would take upon themselves to exercise the royal prerogative, and, indirectly, to *confer* titles by the removal of the present penalties for their assumption; and *what* titles, do you suppose? and upon *whom?* the titles of the sees into which they have irregularly intruded

[5] Literæ Apostolicæ, quibus institutio, confirmatio, et varia privilegia continentur Societatis Jesu, Antverp. 1635. p. 11, 63. Speciali voto astringimur, ut quicquid modernus et alii Romani pontifices jusserint, ad profectum animarum et fidei propagationem, illicò exequi teneamur.

themselves, on Roman Catholic ecclesiastics in England and Ireland! Not to say that such an act as this would be one of flagrant schism [6], inasmuch as it would set up bishop against bishop, and altar against altar, from one end of Great Britain to the other, and an act of most unwarrantable injustice towards the present holders of these titles; it would also be an invasion of the rights of the Crown, and a destruction of the foundations of the British throne. All titles of honour are derived from the Crown alone [7]: and the assertion of a right to share with the Crown in conferring them is an encroachment on the royal prerogative; and I would respectfully venture to express a doubt whether even *deliberation* upon it is not very like an unconstitutional usurpation of that nature. It would, I say, Sir, seem worthy of consideration, whether it is not an invasion of the Queen's rights for subjects to discuss the collation of titles at all; and secondly, and much more so, to deliberate on the collation of them on *Romanist* bishops, *as such*. If ecclesiastics, intruded on us by the pope, consecrated by his sole appointment, and bound to him by an oath of vassalage, should ever

[6] S. Cyprian, ep. 52. Quisquis post unum episcopum factus est, non jam secundus ille, sed nullus est. Ep. 67. Foris esse cœpit qui, episcopo ordinato, profanum altare erigere, adulteram cathedram collocare tentaverit.

[7] Blackstone, i. 7. iv. The Crown has "the sole power of conferring dignities and honours."

be thought thereby qualified, *ipso facto*, to bear English titles and dignities, then the regalities of the English Crown would be suspended, and it would abandon the protest in its own behalf, that "no foreign prince, prelate, or potentate hath any jurisdiction, power, or authority in this realm of England[8]." "*No* bishop, no king," said King James[9]; but put *two* bishops—one of them a subject of the pope—into the same see, and then, "*two* bishops, and *no* king," would be, at least, equally true.

III. Thirdly, it is proposed by some, that all penalties for bringing in bulls from Rome should be abolished. Those who know Rome best—Spain, Austria, Portugal, and France, all Roman Catholic countries—appear to like her bulls least. *Fœnum habet in cornu — longè fuge!* they say, and will not allow a single bull to be introduced, before it is carefully examined by the civil power[1]. But, to speak seriously, you my dear Sir, must smile at the temerity and self-conceit of those persons who appear to consider themselves so much wiser than all European nations, since they propose that *we*, a *Protestant* people, should admit freely from Rome what Roman Catholic states carefully exclude.

What, Sir, may be asked, would then become of

[8] Oath of Supremacy: see above, p. 8.

[9] See Judicium Acad. Oxon. de Solenni Liga, p. 19.

[1] See Report of Select Committee on Regulation of Roman Catholic Subjects in Foreign Countries. Lond. 1816, p. 3—35.

our love for our sovereign? what of our loyalty for the monarch who is alive? what of our reverence for the dead? It would be a cruel insult alike to the living and to the departed kings and queens of England, to legalize the admission of these papal edicts, when we know what has been, and still is, their language toward the holders of the English crown.

As long as those impious, sanguinary, and treasonable anathemas, which were pronounced by the Roman pontiff against Henry VIII. and Queen Elizabeth[2], as long as that tissue of curses against *all* Protestant princes and people, contained in the bull *In Cœnâ Domini*, remain in the pages of the *Roman Bullarium*, so long it would appear to be a treasonable[3] act against the Crown, an act of outrage against the Divine Being, Whose minister the Queen is, and one of contumelious scorn towards her subjects, to propose the admission of bulls from Rome into England.

IV. Fourthly, it is proposed to relieve English Romanists from the obligation to take the oath of the

[2] See above, p. 12.

[3] Concerning the bull against Queen Elizabeth, (which, as well as that against Henry VIII., is still retained in the Bullarium,) Lord Keeper Burleigh thus wrote. "The pope's bull aforementioned, imports that her majesty is not lawful Queen of England,—the first and highest point of *treason;* and that all her subjects are discharged of their oaths and obedience,—another high point of *treason;* and all warranted to disobey her and her laws,—a third and very large point of *treason*."—Burleigh's "Execution of Justice in England, not for Religion, but for Treason," 17 Dec. 1583, p. 15.

Queen's Supremacy, as it now stands[4]; or, in other words, to dispense, in their case, with the affirmation that "princes excommunicated by the pope may be murdered by their subjects;" and that "no foreign prince, prelate, or potentate, hath or ought to have any jurisdiction or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this realm."

What is this but to call upon the State to legalize a public profession on their part, that they are *not* subjects of the Crown; and to make this *non-subjection* of theirs the occasion, groundwork, and reason for legislative innovations and aggressions against the Crown and the Constitution; or, in other words, because it is supposed that some persons are disloyal enough to deny the independence of the Crown, and to pay little regard even to the personal safety of the monarch (for it is proposed to suppress the clause that "deposed sovereigns may not be murdered;" and *what* sovereign of *England* is *not* in fact deposed[5] by the pope?)—therefore the rights of

[4] 5 Eliz. cap. i., as modified by 1 Will. and Mar. cap. 8 (see Gibson's Codex, 52, 61); see also 1 Geo. I. 2, c. 13. By the last-mentioned statute (see above, p. 8) the oath is to be taken by *official* persons at their *admission* to office; and I am not aware that it has been proposed to repeal *this*, further than it has been already by the Roman Catholic Relief Bill of 1829; but the right of the Crown to call upon *all* its subjects at *all* times to testify their allegiance to it, as having supreme authority in this realm, is what is secured by the act of Elizabeth: and this it *is* proposed to repeal.

[5] See above, p. 12, 13. The pope told Queen Elizabeth at her

the Crown, instead of being more vigorously asserted, are to be sacrificed; and the person of the sovereign, instead of being more carefully guarded, is to be put in peril! For my own part, I feel persuaded, that those of the loyal Roman Catholic laity, who candidly consider this matter, must *resent* the offer of such *relief* (as it is called) as this, as an insult to their honour; and that, instead of regarding it as a boon to be distinguished from their Protestant fellow-subjects and fellow-citizens in the manner proposed, they would rather abhor such a discriminating mark as a brand of infamy, not less shameful and odious, than that of outlawry itself.

But, sir, you may desire to know on what grounds such propositions as these are made.

I. First, then, it is alleged that the laws which these propositions would repeal are "the offspring of a *dark age.*" A *dark* age! The age of Shakspeare, of Spenser, of Ben Jonson, of Burleigh, and Salisbury, and Raleigh, of Bacon, and of Coke, of Jewell, and Hooker, and of Andrewes! A dark age! *Dark* indeed, in a certain sense, it was, when those deeds of darkness were performed under the authority and with the approval of the papacy, which rendered those laws necessary. Dark indeed it was, when on

accession, that England "era feudo della sede apostolica; ch' era stata una grand' audacia dell' haver' assonto il nome di Regina ed il governo senza lui"—Sarpi's History of the Council of Trent, lib. v. See also Ranke's History of the Popes, p. 80, 81.

the night of the 24th of August, 1572, St. Bartholomew's day, above five thousand Protestants were murdered at Paris, and when within a few days after it, in six towns of France, five-and-twenty thousand more were slain[6]; dark it was when as soon as he heard of this dreadful massacre, Pope Gregory XIII., went in procession to the Church of St. Louis, at Rome[7], to give God thanks; and when, to commemorate this event, he ordered a medal to be struck, of which an engraving now lies before me[8], which represents this savage work as performed by an *angel* of heaven, with a sword in one hand and a cross in the other, and which bears the inscription, VGONOTTORVM STRAGES, THE MASSACRE OF THE HUGUENOTS: dark it was, when on the 1st of August, 1589, the friar Jaques Clement[9], "having learnt from theologians whom he had consulted, that a tyrant might lawfully be put to death," went and assassinated

[6] Ranke (History of the Popes, p. 147) says, "the numbers that fell amounted to 50,000."

[7] Lord Clarendon, Religion and Polity, p. 427. "Notorious it is that Gregory XIII. had no sooner notice of that barbarous and inhuman massacre of St. Bartholomew, than he went in solemn procession to the Church of St. Louis in Rome to give God thanks."

[8] In p. 87 of Historia Summorum Pontificum por corum Numismata, a Molinet, Lutet. 1679 which is dedicated by the author to a pope, Innocent XI.

[9] These are the words of the Jesuit Mariana, "Jac. Clemens cognito a theologis quos erat sciscitatus tyrannum jure interimi posse cæso rege ingens sibi nomen fecit." See Ranke's History, p. 177. Fleury, Discours sur les Libertés, &c. p. 80, note.

his own sovereign, your King Henry III.; dark it was, when on hearing the intelligence of that king's death, Pope Sixtus V. summoned a consistory of his cardinals, and in a set speech ascribed the murder of the king "to the providence of God," and spoke of it as a pledge that "the Almighty would still protect France[1];" dark it was, when on the 14th of May, 1610, Ravaillac the Jesuit effected what, in 1594, Jean Chastel, the Jesuit, had attempted, and murdered your sovereign Henry IV., and after the deed was done freely confessed that it was the book of Mariana the Jesuit which encouraged him to that design[2]; dark it was,

[1] Il Papa nel consistorio discorre che 'l successo della morte del rè di Francia si ha da conoscer dal voler expresso del Signor Dio, e che perciò si doveva confidar che continuarebbe al haver quel regno nella sua protezione." Dispaccio Veneto, quoted by Ranke, p. 173: compare Lord Clarendon, p. 465. "The news of this horrid parricide was no sooner brought to Rome, than the pope presently called a consistory, that he might be the first reporter of it, when he made the relation of it in such a manner as made it evident that he was well enough content to be thought the author; and he even solemnized the memory of the friar for his unparalleled zeal and courage, in that speech of his to the consistory, of which there are too many records preserved to have it ever forgotten." See also Thuani Historia, tom. iv. ad ann. 1589, ed. 1620, who says, "that Sixtus V. in a premeditated speech made in the consistory on the 3rd of the Ides of September, compared the deed on account of its greatness to our blessed Lord's incarnation and resurrection, and extolled the author of it above Eleazar and Judith, &c." the original Latin speech was printed at Paris in 1585. It will be found in Foulis' History of Romish Treasons, p. 413. Davila Historia, lib. x. ad ann. 1589.

[2] De Rege et Regis Institutione, Mog. 1605. See notes to Fleury

when at several times after the publication of the papal Bull against her in 1567, (Feb. 24,) the life of our gracious Queen Elizabeth was attempted, as in 1572, by Story, again in 1583, by Somerville, again in 1585, by Parry, stimulated by the pope's nuncio, and in 1586 by Savage, having plenary indulgence from the pope, as appears from the letter of a Cardinal di Como, dated Rome, 30 Jan. 1584, again by Moody in 1587, again by Patrick in 1594, by Lopez and York in the same year, again by Squire in 1598, by Winter in 1602[3], from all which traitorous designs, set on foot by the arts and arms of Rome, she was delivered by the merciful interference of divine Providence; and dark it was, when in the year 1605, a conspiracy was made to destroy the king, royal family, lords and commons of England, and when Bulls from Rome were ready[4] to give complete effect to what was then decreed; dark, I say, the age may well be called, when such acts as these were concerted and executed. But in another sense that age was one of *light*. Wisdom guided the councils of England, and sound laws were enacted, by which, under the divine blessing, these

Discours, p. 80, and P. Du Moulin's Anticoton, quoted by Bp. Barlow, Brutum fulmen, p. 196.

[3] See Camdeni Annales Elizabethæ, in these years.

[4] See Bp. Andrewes' Reply to Cardinal Bellarmine, cap. v. p. 113. ed. 1610. "E vestris unus atque is Jesuita apud nos fassus est in id ipsum tempus, quo accensus hic pulvis et strages subsecuta procusum fuisse fulmen trisulcum, bullas tres, statim, ubi confecta res, Pontificis nomine publicandas, quibus tria in Regno loca confestim ferienda."

dark designs were defeated: and the light of peace and liberty and public safety were diffused throughout the realm. *But*, if in a spirit of presumptuous contempt for the wisdom of that age, and of arrogant confidence in our own sagacity, *we* abolish these laws, who shall say that we shall not *bring back* in all its gloom the *thick darkness* which they dispersed?

In the meantime, if we desire to prove that we are ourselves in darkness, we have only to be guilty of the folly, as far as regards England, of calling that age a dark one. If we will call it such, O that we ourselves had more of its darkness and less of our own light! O that we had more of its loyalty and piety, more of its steadiness of purpose, more of its faith in fixed principles, and more of its courage in carrying them into practice!

In further justice to these laws, I shall content myself with referring to the character which is given of them by three of our greatest statesmen and lawyers, Lord Treasurer Burleigh[5], Lord High Chancellor Bacon[6], and Lord High Chancellor Clarendon[7].

II. But, secondly, it is alleged that these laws ought to be *repealed*, on the great principle of religious toleration; that none of "*Her Majesty's sub-*

[5] Lord Burleigh, Execution of Justice in England, not for Religion but for Treason, 1583.

[6] Lord Bacon, Observations on a Libel, 1592, vol. ii. p. 42, ed. Lond. 1778. [7] Lord Clarendon, Religion and Polity, p. 424.

jects" ought to suffer penalties for "*religious opinions;*" and that our Most Gracious Sovereign ought "to be the Queen of *all* her subjects."

Now, first of all,—as to the point of *repealing* laws against the pope, I should be very glad to be informed whether *he* has ever repealed any one of *his* laws against *us?* Has he ever erased a single line of his canon law in which, as I have shown[8], he claims the power of deposing princes and absolving subjects from their allegiance? Never. Has he ever revoked one of his unchristian anathemas against us and our princes? Never. Has he ever ceased to impose *his* own oaths of allegiance and supremacy on the Romish ecclesiastical subjects of the Queen of England? and to teach them that all their *civil* oaths to their sovereign, to the prejudice of his own interest, are perjuries? Never. Has he ever allowed a word to be breathed in favour of our oaths, of allegiance and supremacy, or permitted our books in its favour to be admitted into his dominions, as some of us would admit bulls from Rome into England? Never. And yet we are, forsooth, to be called upon to repeal *our* laws against *his* unjust and unholy usurpations and aggressions against the rights of the British crown and the liberties of the subject, and to give free admission and even titles of distinction to Jesuits and other Romish ecclesiastics, who are

[8] Above, p. 12.

bound to him by a most solemn oath of obedience, and who are obliged by that oath to teach the doctrine of the pope's supremacy, and, by consequence, to subvert that of the Queen? And all this on the "great principle of religious *toleration!*" O most intolerant toleration! O most iniquitous *persecution!* which would *tolerate every thing* but that which ought most to be secured and encouraged; which would tolerate sedition and discountenance loyalty; which would tolerate Jesuits and the pope, but would *not* tolerate the Queen; which would sacrifice the Crown, and boast of its gentleness; which would talk of "civil and religious liberty," and degrade its Sovereign to a slave.

But, thirdly, it is said "Her *Majesty's subjects*" ought to be relieved from all "penalties and disabilities in regard to their *religious opinions.*" Certainly; this is very true: but then, first, it is equally true that they who *ought* to be *Her* Majesty's subjects and are *not*, but who choose to be the Pope's subjects, ought *not* to be relieved from penalties and disabilities in regard to their *irreligious practices.* Under the words "*religious* opinions" lurks the old fallacy, which was exposed so well by Lord Burleigh, in that "dark age" of which we have just heard, in his admirable work entitled "Execution of *Justice* in England, not for *Religion*, but *Treason.*"

He there says[9], speaking of papists who were pu-

[9] p. 15.

nished for traitorous practices in Queen Elizabeth's reign, that "whereas the party of the pope, the principal author of the invasion of Her Majesty's dominions, do *allege* that a number of persons, whom they call *martyrs*[1], died for defence of the Catholic *religion*, the same in very truth may manifestly appear to have died (if they will so have it) as *martyrs* for the *pope*, but *traitors* against their *queen*, in adhering to him." And in the same dark age, Lord Bacon tells us, "that Queen Elizabeth was firm to the resolution not to suffer the state of her kingdom to be ruined under *pretence* of *conscience* and *religion*[2]." And, in the same manner, King James I.[3] writes, "I must ever avow and maintain, as the truth is according to mine own knowledge, that the late Queen of famous memory *never* punished any papist for *religion*, but that their own punishment was extorted out of her hands by their own *misbehaviour*,"—which he proceeds to prove. They were punished, he shows, not for "*religious opinions*," but for "*rebellious acts*" under the fair name of religion, which was used by Pope Paul V. when he wrote, in his brief of Oct. 1, 1606, to all English Romanists, that "the oath of *allegiance* to the English crown could not be taken by them without injury to the *Catholic faith!*" and we know well

[1] See on this point Bishop Barlow's *Brutum Fulmen*, p. 187.

[2] Sir Roger L'Estrange, Toleration Discussed, p. 104.

[3] Apology for the Oath of Allegiance, Works, p. 252.

(in the words of Bishop Sanderson) that "nothing is more common than for men to plead *conscience* when they have no mind to *obey*," and that disobedience and disloyalty is *no* part of *religion*, nor any fruit or sign of it. So it is now: the penalties and disabilities, which it is proposed to abolish, do not lie on "*religious opinions*" at all, but on disloyal and seditious practices, of which if persons choose to be guilty, they must and ought to expect *penalties* and *disabilities;* and the true, the *only*, *relief* for them lies not with *us*, but with *themselves:* it is to be derived from *their altering* their *practices*, not from *our repealing* our *laws*.

But it is said, in the next place, that "Her Majesty's *subjects*" should be relieved from these penalties; and that the "Queen ought to be the sovereign of *all* her *subjects*." This last assertion is very true: but then it is first to be ascertained whether they *are* her *subjects*, or will be so. Here is another fallacy lying hid under the word *subjects*. Would to heaven, indeed, that they were her subjects; and that she were the sovereign of all her subjects! This indeed would be a most blessed consummation. Then all this controversy would be at end. But if, alas! some of her subjects are so forgetful of their duty to her as to withdraw their allegiance from her, and to take an oath of vassalage to a foreign power, it is a manifest absurdity to speak of their being any longer her subjects. No: they have revolted from her; and no

Acts of Parliament in the world can *make* them her subjects by *calling* them so. A parliament which would attempt such a project as this would only stultify itself. And if our laws should ever be altered in the vain hope of changing the pope's subjects into the Queen's, by removing all their disabilities for their disloyalty, then the inevitable consequence would be, that instead of *gaining* those who are *not* her subjects, she would *lose* those who *are*, and in lieu of being the "sovereign of *all* her subjects," she would cease to be the sovereign of *any*.

From all that I have now said, you will perceive, my dear Sir, that we in England have little reason, and, I trust, little disposition, to boast ourselves at your expense. Every one who has the feeling of a true patriot, must indeed earnestly pray that his own beloved country and the crown of its august monarch may for ever remain *Christian*, and that it may ever remain *free*. But we should have little of the spirit of Christianity or of freedom, if we did not desire also for *you* what we so earnestly cherish for ourselves. Oh! that your Monarchy and Church were once more united together in a happy alliance, the one Christian, the other free! Why should not an Irenæus[4] arise once more among you to remind the Bishop of Rome of his true position, and to give him friendly rebuke instead of treacherous adulation! and

[4] Euseb. v. 24.

why should not the hand of the French Church, animated by the spirit of the Gospel, endeavour to restore to the Crown those fair flowers of religion and piety which once bloomed upon it, but have been torn from it by the Charte?

But, to revert to what I was saying: with your example before our eyes, with the exhibition which you present to us of the destruction of a religious *establishment*, and of the lamentable consequences to the cause of Christianity, and of the Crown, to the Church, and to the Country, *we*, if we proceed further than we have already done in following your steps, shall be guilty of greater rashness and sin, and may expect greater misery and shame.

But we confidently hope better things. Our great Queen Elizabeth was excommunicated by three popes, Pius V., Gregory XIII., and Sixtus V., the last of whom sent the Spanish Armada against her, published a crusade against us, as if we were infidels, and gave plenary indulgence[5] to all who should assist in the invasion. She was assailed by numerous conspiracies. But she, who was cursed by Popes, was blessed by God. She was strong in His faith and fear, and in the love of her people; and to quote the words of her great minister, Lord Burleigh[6], "For the comfort of all good subjects, against the pope's bulls, it is

[5] Camden, Annales Eliz. lib. iii. ad Ann. 1688.

[6] Execution, p. 35.

manifest to the world, that from the beginning of her majesty's reign, by God's singular goodness, her kingdom hath enjoyed more universal peace, her people increased in more numbers, in more strength, and with great riches, the earth of her kingdom hath yielded more fruits, and generally all kind of worldly felicity hath more abounded since and during the time of the pope's bulls, thunders, curses, and maledictions, than in any other long time before, when the pope's pardons and blessings came yearly into the realm; so that his curses and maledictions have turned back to himself and his fautors, and it may be said to the fortunate Queen of England and her people, "The Lord thy God would not hear Balaam, but did turn his curses into blessings; the reason is, for because thy God loved thee."

So may it ever be with her successors on the throne of England!

Permit me, my dear sir, to state what appears to me to be the great *practical* inference to be drawn from the facts and principles which I have now laid before you, and I will bring this letter to a close.

First, I would venture to submit with great reverence and humility, to the consideration of sovereign princes and states, whether, instead of repealing their own just and necessary laws against the papacy, they ought not rather to unite together in requiring the pope to retract his illegal acts and decrees

against their lawful authority; whether they ought not to call on him to withdraw the illicit oath [7] which he now presumes to impose on their subjects, and to erase from his CANON LAW, his BULLARIUM, and his BREVIARY, all those seditious statutes, edicts, collects, lessons, and imprecations, which infringe on their prerogatives, and impugn the royalties of the sovereignty, and the liberties of the subject: whether, in fact, they ought not to arise and emancipate themselves and their people (if he is unwilling to release them) from the thraldom to which he has

[7] The following propositions deserve to be considered with regard to this oath :—

"1. Allegiance is a duty which every subject, under what form of government soever, by the law of *nature*, oweth to his country, and consequently to the sovereign power thereof.

"2. The bond of Allegiance, whether sworn or not sworn, is in the nature of it perpetual and indispensable.

"3. All Promises and Assurances, wherein faith is required to be given to another, ought to be understood *ad mentem imponentis*. [The *mens imponentis* in the case of the Papal Oath, is clear from the Papal laws.]

"4. We cannot of our own accord enter into a covenant, wherein he, whose subjects we are, is concerned, without his consent.

"5. It is (otherwise) in his power by the equity of the law, Numb. xxx. to annul and make void the same at his pleasure."

These propositions are from Bp. Sanderson, "Case of the Engagement," and of "the Solemn League and Covenant." See also his "Judicium Acad. Oxon. de Solenni Liga," 1 Jan. 1647.

The applicability of these observations to the Oath of Jesuits and Roman Catholic bishops to the Pope, is too obvious to require to be further insisted on.

reduced them, and which he is making daily more grievous to be borne; whether they ought not to warn him to confine himself within the limits of his own dominions in temporal concerns, and whether in *spiritual* matters they ought to suffer themselves to be carried away by the opinions of a few, and not rather refer to the most celebrated Universities of Europe, and, if practicable, to a General Council of the whole Church, lawfully convoked, and with free power of deliberation, this one important question: "Whether by the law of God, and the practice of the primitive Church, the Bishop of Rome possesses any greater spiritual authority, power, or jurisdiction within their realms than any other foreign prelate of the Church;" and if this question be answered in the negative, then whether they ought not to require the pope to restrain himself and his commands within the limits of his own patriarchate, according to the decree of the great General Council[8] of Nice; and, in the meantime, until such a consultation as this be held, whether every Nation and Church ought not to keep itself as near as may be to that order which it ought to have, according to law both human and divine, and, in so doing, to rest in faith on the aid and defence of Him who is the Author of all Law, and the Avenger of all Iniquity; and to look forward in sure and certain hope to the glorious time when the

[8] Canon 6.

great Head of the whole Church, and the King of kings, will come again to reward all His faithful subjects, and to put all His enemies under His feet.

I am, my dear Sir,

Yours very faithfully,

&c. &c.

THE END.

GILBERT & RIVINGTON, Printers, St. John's Square, London.

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

DIARY IN FRANCE,

Mainly on Topics concerning Education and the Church.

Second Edition, in the Press.

THEOPHILUS ANGLICANUS;

Or, Instruction for the Young Student concerning the Church, and our own Branch of it.

Fourth Edition.

LETTERS to a FRIEND in FRANCE,

On certain Important Religious Questions of the Present Times.

Preparing for publication.